

John A. Hawkinson, freelance news reporter  
Box 397103  
Cambridge, MA 02139-7103  
617-797-0250, [jhawk@alum.MIT.EDU](mailto:jhawk@alum.MIT.EDU)

The Honorable William G. Young  
One Courthouse Way, Suite 2300  
Boston, MA 02210

April 1, 2020

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL, with leave: [media@mad.uscourts.gov](mailto:media@mad.uscourts.gov)

**Letter-request<sup>1</sup> for expedited media access in *Savino v. Hodgson*, 20-cv-10617-WGY**

Dear Judge Young:

I am a freelance reporter writing for *Cambridge Day* covering immigration cases in this court, including the above-captioned case.

Because it is an immigration case, access to its filings are restricted<sup>2</sup> to counsel in PACER; because of COVID-19 and the Governor's order restricting travel, it is challenging to get timely access to documents. And access at the Courthouse is not available after 2pm due to the Clerk's Office's new schedule.

After consultation with the Clerk, I respectfully request you exercise your powers under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(c) and General Order 19-02 ¶4 to lift access restrictions on this case's documents. It is a fast-moving class action of high prominence, and the personal privacy issues the Rule is designed to protect are absent here. Under-signed hopes Your Honor may expedite this matter and rule at Thursday's hearing.

Petitioners assent to this request. Respondents have not answered an inquiry lodged Sunday night, but Rayford A. Farquhar, Chief of Defensive Litigation for the U.S. Attorney's Office, has previously stated that, as a general matter, "the office policy under our new U.S. Attorney is that we are not going to assent, we are not going to object, but we are going to leave it up to the Court to decide on a case-by-case basis."

Collaterally, undersigned also requests you continue to make Zoom videoconferencing fully available to the public and press when they are used, as you did Monday, so we can see the faces and expressions that counsel and the Court see. Virtual public attendance at such hearings would not constitute the prohibited "broadcasting" under the rules, and relegating the public to an audio-only version leaves us with impaired access to the proceeding. (See April 1 letter to Chief Judge Saylor.)

Thank you for Your Honor's kind attention.

Very truly yours,  
/s/ John A. Hawkinson  
John A. Hawkinson

cc: Counsel of record (via email)

<sup>1</sup>If preferred, I'd be pleased to move to intervene accompanied by this request in motion and memorandum form. It would be substantially similar to *Pereira Brito v. Barr*, No. 19-cv-11314-PBS, ECF No.s 10-12.

<sup>2</sup>This was originally filed as NOS 440—Other Civil Rights—so documents were available in PACER. But it was reclassified to NOS 463—Alien Detainee—automatically blocking public access to subsequent filings.